REMARKS

In this Amendment, Applicant amends 1, 8 and 15 and cancels claim 23 without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claim claims 1-22 and 24 are all the claims pending in the application. The newly added features are at least supported by page 21, line 16 to page 23, line 12 and FIGS. 3 and 4 of the specification.

I.   Statement of Substance of Interview

As a preliminary matter, the undersigned thanks Examiner Dohm Chankong for the courtesy of the interview conducted on March 3, 2011, between the Examiner and Applicant's representative Ebenesar D. Thomas. During the interview, Applicant's representative and the Examiner discussed the patentability of independent claims 1, 8 and 15. In particular, Applicant's representative asserted that the cited prior art references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose "the port module determines a last status of the data source and reconnects the remote application to the data source based on the determination of the last status of the data source by directly communicating with the remote application and bypassing the connection manager," as recited in independent claims 1, 8 and 15. In response, the Examiner explained his interpretation of the Rizvi reference and requested the Applicant to submit the arguments discussed during the interview for further consideration. No agreement was reached with regard to this feature. However, the Examiner indicated that amending claims 1, 8 and 15 to include the feature of the port module sends an error message to the interface module indicating the unavailability of the data source, overcomes the cited prior art references.

II.   Prior Art Rejections

Claims 1-19, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Polizzi et al (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0023158; hereinafter "Polizzi") in view of Guenthner et

al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,134,588; hereinafter "Guenthner"), further in view of Ohran et al. (U.S.

Patent No. 5,812,748; hereinafter "Ohran") further in view of Rizvi et al. (U.S. Patent No.

6,490,610; hereinafter "Rizvi").

Claims 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Polizzi,

Guenthner, Ohran and Rizvi further in view of Brendel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,774,660;

hereinafter "Brendel").

Applicant traverses the rejection as follows.

Claims 1, 8 and 15

Claim 1 recites, *inter alia*, "wherein the at least one port module detects the unavailability

of the data source, sends an error message to the interface module indicating the unavailability of

the data source, detects the availability of the data source in response to the subsequent request

for the data source, reestablishes a connection with the data source, and reconnects the remote

application to the data source directly communicating with the remote application and bypassing

the connection manager in the subsequent request." Applicant respectfully submits that the

applied prior art references, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest these features of

claim 1.

Rizvi discloses a client 216 that includes a database application 202 and client driver

interface 204, a Database Server 206, 210, and Database 214 (FIG. 2). Applicant respectfully

disagrees with the Office's assertion, in page 6 of the Office Action, that the client interface module corresponds to the claimed port module. For instance, Rizvi in FIG. 2 shows that the client driver interface 214 is part of the client 216, and therefore the client driver interface does not correspond to the claimed at least one port module configured to interface between the interface module and the data source. Moreover, according to claim 1, the port module sends an error message to the interface module indicating the unavailability of the data source. Applicant respectfully submits that the client driver interface does not teach or suggest sending an error message to the interface module indicating the unavailability of the data source, and therefore does not correspond to the claimed port module.

Furthermore, the data server 206, 210 of Rizvi does not correspond to the claimed port module because Rizvi does not teach or suggest that the data server 206, 210 detects the unavailability of the data source, sends an error message to the interface module indicating the unavailability of the data source, detects the availability of the data source in response to the subsequent request for the data source, reestablishes a connection with the data source, and reconnects the remote application to the data source directly communicating with the remote application and bypassing the connection manager in the subsequent request.

Guenthner discloses that a browser should detect a failure to reply by a server and attempt to connect to another address in a primary/backup list (column 9, lines 16-35). Ohran discloses that the NETWARE loadable module sets communication means to disconnect mass storage system 122 from computer 121 and connects it to computer 111 (column 8, lines 23-28). However, Guenthner and Ohran do not teach or suggest that the "port module detects the

unavailability of the data source, sends an error message to the interface module indicating the

unavailability of the data source, detects the availability of the data source in response to the

subsequent request for the data source, reestablishes a connection with the data source, and

reconnects the remote application to the data source directly communicating with the remote

application and bypassing the connection manager in the subsequent request."

Also, Polizzi does not teach or suggest these features of claim 1.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1, 8 and 15 are

patentable over the cited combination of references.

Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-19 and 24

Claims 2-7, 9-14, 16-19 and 24 that depend from claims 1, 8 and 15 are patentable over

the cited combination of references at least by virtue of their dependency and the additional

features recited therein.

Claims 20-22

Applicant respectfully submits that since claims 20-22 depend claims 1, 8 and 15, and

since Brendel does not teach or suggest the features of claims 1, 8 and 15 missing in Polizzi,

Guenthner, Ohran and Rizvi, claims 20-22 are patentable over the cited combination of

references at least by virtue of their dependency and the additional features recited therein.

IV.   Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed

to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the

Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is

kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

     The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue

Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any

overpayments to said Deposit Account.

                                        Respectfully submitted,

                                        /Ebenesar D. Thomas/

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC   Ebenesar D. Thomas
Telephone: (202) 293-7060   Registration No. 62,499
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860
WASHINGTON DC SUGHRUE/142133

    46159
     CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 4, 2011